

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed on November 1, 2010, claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Srikanteswara et al. (S. Srikanteswara, J.H. Reed, P. Athanas, R. Boyle, "A Soft Radio Architecture For Reconfigurable Platforms," IEEE Communications Magazine, February 2000, pages 140 -147, hereinafter "Srikanteswara") in view of Marinissen et al. (E.J. Marinissen, Y. Zorian, R. Kapur, T. Taylor, L. Whetsel, "Towards A Standard For Embedded Core Test: An Example," Proceedings of the IEEE International Test Conference, pages 616 - 627, 1999, hereinafter "Marinissen I"), and further in view of Marinissen et al. (E. Marinissen, R. Kapur, M. Lousberg, T. McLaurin, M. Ricchetti, and Y. Zorian, "On IEEE 1500's Standard For Embedded Core Test," Journal of Electronic Testing, Volume 18, page 365-383, August 2002, hereinafter "Marinissen II"). Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Srikanteswara in view of Marinissen I, further in view of Marinissen II, and further in view of Zorian et al. (Y. Zorian, E. Marinissen, S. Dey, "Testing Embedded-Core-Based System Chips," Proceedings of the IEEE International Test Conference, 1998, pages 130-143, hereinafter "Zorian"). Additionally, claims 6 and 7 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicants propose amending claims 1, 3 and 7. In addition, Applicants propose canceling claims 2, 6 and 9. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 6 and 7 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent Claim 1

In response, claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claims 2 and 6. In addition, claim 1 has been further amended to correct an informality, i.e., to replace the term “each interface circuits” with the term “*each interface circuit.*” Because claim 6 was found to recite allowable subject matter, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 3-5, 7 and 8

Applicants note that claims 2 and 6 have been canceled. Claims 3 and 7 have been amended to reflect the correct claim dependencies. Claims 3-5, 7 and 8 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-5, 7 and 8 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Generally, in this Amendment and Response to the Final Office Action, Applicants have not raised all possible grounds for (a) traversing the rejections of the Office Action or (b) patentably distinguishing any new or currently amended claims (i.e., over the cited references or otherwise). Applicants however, reserve the right to explicate and expand on any ground already raised and/or to raise other grounds for traversing and/or for distinguishing, including, without limitation, by explaining and/or distinguishing the subject matter of the Application and/or any cited reference at a later time (e.g., in the event that this Application does not proceed to issue with the current pending claims, or in the context of a continuing application). Applicants submit that nothing herein is, or should be deemed to be, a disclaimer of any rights, acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been raised but were not raised herein, or otherwise in the prosecution of this Application, whether as to the original claims or as to any of the new or amended claims, or otherwise. Without

limiting the generality of the foregoing, Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce one or more of the original claims in original form or otherwise so as to claim the subject matter of those claims, both/either at a later time in prosecuting this Application or in the context of a continuing application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 19, 2010

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
1811 Santa Rita Road, Suite 130
Pleasanton, CA 94566
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111